Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/089,013	MARSHALL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emily Bernhardt	1624
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) Emily Bernhardt.	(3)	
(2) <u>Mr. Kanagy</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 February 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.	•	
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: New claims 17-19 Prior art documents discussed:	·	
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summare 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	interview. since the interview
		,
		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	Applicant's Representative Signature	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The species covered by the newly presented claims is free of the 112 and art rejections of the previous action as particularly pointed out by applicants in their response. Nothing relevant found from a search for the new species presented. The term "monohydrochloride" lacks antecedent basis in the specification but "hydrochloride" would be acceptable. Also intended use(s) need to be inserted into the Abstract. Mr. Kanagy agreed to the above change in the claim and authorized the examiner to insert a use statement in the abstract consistent with specification's teachings.